IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 7.11.2007

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.D.DINAKARAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.REGUPATHI

H.C.P.No.1152 of 2007

Deivanai .. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu
rep. by its Secretary to Government
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George, Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2. The District Magistrate
and District Collector
Vellore District, Vellore. .. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue Habeas Corpus as stated therein.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Kannadasan

For Respondents : Mr.M.Babu Muthu Meeran
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by P.D.DINAKARAN,J.)

The second respondent herein clamped an order of detention as against Thirupathy, son of Kannaiyan, husband of the petitioner, as the said authority arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the said detenu is a Bootlegger and he has to be detained under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Officers, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982).

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2.1. The order of detention dated 25.7.2007 came to be passed by the second respondent on the basis of the ground case said to have taken place on 9.7.2007, complaint of which was given by one Nazeer. According to the complainant, on 9.7.2007, at about 11.00 am, with an intention to consume liquor, he went to A.K.Mottur Kolla Kottai and found the detenu selling arrack. He purchased and consumed one glass tumbler of arrack. He felt more intoxication, dimness of vision and vomited twice or thrice. He could not walk and became unconscious. He woke up at 2.30 pm, when to Tirupattur Taluk Police Station and gave a complaint which was registered as Crime No.749 of 2007 for the offences punishable under Sections 4(1)(i)(aaa), 4(1-A)(ii) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act. The Inspector of Police formed a special party and found the detenu indulging in sale of arrack. The detenu was arrested and contraband was seized. On chemical analysis, the Scientific Officer and Assistant Chemical Examiner to the Government, Regional Forensic Science Laboratory, Vellore stated that the arrack is mixed with 6.9 mg. of atrophine per 100 ml. arrack and the same is a poisonous substance.

2.2. Apart from the above, the detaining authority also took note of the five adverse cases pending against the detenu, viz., Crime Nos.927, 1110 and 1277 of 2006 and 91 and 379 of 2007 on the file of the Tirupattur Taluk Police Station for the offence punishable under Sections 4(1)(aaa) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act.

2.3. The detaining authority, having satisfied that the detenu is indulging in activities which are prejudicial to maintenance of public order and public health, passed the impugned order.

3. Challenging the said detention, the wife of the detenu has come forward with the present Habeas Corpus Petition seeking a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 25.7.2007 in his office Ref.No.C3.D.O.No.58/2007 against the detenu, now confined at Central Prison, Vellore, Vellore District, to set aside the same and to direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and to set him at liberty.

4. Heard Mr.E.Kannadasan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.M.Babu Muthu Meeran, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

5. The only contention advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that there is considerable delay in considering the representation and the same has rendered the detention illegal.

6.1. Before delving into the issue relating to the delay as contended above, it would be apt to refer the law on the point.

6.2. Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India suggests that the obligation of the government is to offer the detenu an opportunity of making a representation against the order, before it is confirmed according to the procedure laid down under the relevant provisions of law, vide K.M. Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India, (1991) 1 SCC 476 .

6.3. The right to representation under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India includes right to expeditious disposal by the State Government. Expedition is the rule and delay defeats mandate of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, vide Ram Sukrya Mhatre v. R.D. Tyagi, 1992 Supp (3) SCC 65.

6.4. Any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the detention illegal, vide Tara Chand v. State of Rajasthan, (1980) 2 SCC 321 and Raghavendra Singh v. Supdt., Distt. Jail, (1986) 1 SCC 650.

6.5. It is a constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words "as soon as may be" in clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest. But that does not mean that the authority is pre-empted from explaining any delay which would have occasioned in the disposal of the representation. The court can certainly consider whether the delay was occasioned due to permissible reasons or unavoidable causes. If delay was caused on account of any indifference or lapse in considering the representation, such delay will adversely affect further detention of the prisoner. In other words, it is for the authority concerned to explain the delay, if any, in disposing of the representation. It is not enough to say that the delay was very short. Even longer delay can as well be explained. So the test is not the duration or range of delay, but how it is explained by the authority concerned. Even the reason that the Minister was on tour and hence there was a delay of five days in disposing of the

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

representation was rejected by the Apex Court holding that when the liberty of a citizen guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India is involved, the absence of the Minister at head quarters is not sufficient to justify the delay, since the file could be reached the Minister with utmost promptitude in cases involving the vitally important fundamental right of a citizen, vide Rajammal v. State of T.N., (1999) 1 SCC 417.

7. In the instant case, the impugned order of detention came to be passed on 25.7.2007. A representation was made to the Government on 7.8.2007 and the same was received by it on 8.8.2007. Parawise remarks were called for from the detaining authority on 9.8.2007. The representation was received by the detaining authority on 14.8.2007 and remarks of the Sponsoring Authority were called for on 14.8.2007 itself. However, the remarks of the Sponsoring Authority were received only on 21.8.2007, viz., after a period of 7 days, even though 15.8.2007, 18.8.2007 and 19.8.2007 happen to be public holidays, still a delay of 4 days exists. This delay was highlighted by the learned counsel for the petitioner. There is no convincing reply on behalf of the State for the said delay. We find some force as well as substance in this contention. We fail to understand as to why the matter was delayed for four days (excluding public holidays). There is absolutely no explanation for this delay.

8. At this juncture, a reference to the decision of the Apex Court in Kundanbhai Dulabhai Sheikh v District Magistrate, Ahmedabad, (1996) 3 SCC 194 is apposite:

> "In spite of law laid down above by this Court repeatedly over the past three decades, the Executive, namely, the State Government and its officers continue to behave in their old, lethargic fashion and like all other files rusting in the Secretariat for various reasons including red-tapism, the representation made by a person deprived of his liberty, continue to be dealt with in the same fashion. The Government and its officers will not give up their habit of maintaining a consistent attitude of lethargy. So also, this Court will not hesitate in quashing the order of detention to restore the 'liberty and freedom' to the person whose detention is allowed to become bad by the Government itself on account of his representation not being disposed of at the earliest."

9. That apart, it is a settled law that there should not be supine indifference, slackness or callous attitude in considering the representation. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal, vide K.M. Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India, (1991) 1 SCC 476 .

The delay of four days which stands unexplained would fatalise the detention attracting Article 22 of the Constitution of India and therefore, the petition must succeed and the same is ordered as prayed for. The detention order dated 25.7.2007 is set aside. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless his custody is required in connection with any other case.

Sasi

Sd/
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

To:

1. The Secretary to Government
   State of Tamilnadu
   Prohibition and Excise Department
   Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.

2. The District Magistrate
   and District Collector
   Vellore District, Vellore.

3. The Public Prosecutor
   High Court, Madras.

4.The Superintendent, Central Prison, Vellore.

5. The Joint Secretary
   to the Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St George, Chennai 9.

WEB COPY

VRK(CO)
SR/21.11.2007



https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/